



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## REVIVAL OF THE MORMON PROBLEM.

BY EUGENE YOUNG.

---

It is with no little wonder that the American people—still vaguely grappling with the results of the war with Spain—have turned from visions of imperial destiny to find renewed defiance of their political and social system in the very heart of the Republic. The nation had believed the Mormon question settled. When the Mormon leaders and conferences agreed, in 1890, that they no longer wished to disobey the will of the American people, and asked that they be considered only by the standard of Americanism, their pledges were accepted, and they were welcomed as prodigals, who thenceforth were not to disturb the domestic tranquility of the nation.

There seems to be a subtle connection, however, between our national troubles and the progress of Mormonism. The war with Mexico found the so-called Latter Day Saints leaving our Republic, embittered against all things American, and determined to find, in the unexplored West, a haven where they would be free from interference. They wanted a holy land—even like Judea of old—where their prophets would be kings, and where the test of the public official and the defender of the state would be his faith in their theology. They found this land, but, after they had settled it, our statesmanship made them Americans still in name, and changed the object of their ambition to that of swaying the great Republic to their own ends.

The beginning of the Civil War found this same people restrained from open sedition only by the presence among them of a strong military force, that was woefully needed for stamping out the first flames of rebellion in the South. The Mormons fretted under the nation's authority. They derided our laws and our system of marriage. They demanded, as of right, sovereign state-

hood, which would permit them to live their religion as they chose, to foster polygamy, and to perpetuate the terrible doctrine of blood atonement for sins. Such, indeed, was their disloyalty to their country in its time of peril that the troops, when called away for service against the forces of secession, destroyed cannon and ammunition rather than leave these stores where they might fall into Mormon hands. During the period of reconstruction the Americanism of Utah rested upon the guns of the fort which frowned upon its capital. Mormons openly defied the Government to administer its laws against polygamy, terrorized those who might think of leaving their fold or of ferreting out its secrets, and, finally, seeing the futility of armed resistance, stubbornly carried their fight into the courts of law in a vain endeavor to impress their practices upon the nation.

The contest, begun with the Civil War, lasted for thirty years; and, after they had exhausted every resource in their efforts to defend themselves, the Mormons declared they had surrendered to overwhelming power. They had, indeed. Their lands had been escheated. Their courts, their juries, their elections, their laws were controlled from Washington, and were in the hands of those who had no sympathy with their beliefs. Polygamists had been disfranchised in Utah and all Mormons disfranchised in Idaho. More than that, leading men and women were in prison for polygamy, or were in hiding from officials whose movements spread terror throughout their villages. Threatened with greater evils even than these, they had no alternative except to give some promise that would shield them for a time. That they did so only when they had fought their case through Congress and then through the Supreme Court of the United States and had found they need expect no mercy, shows how strong a hold their faith had upon them. Their surrender left Mormonism unchanged, however. They did not declare that they had been in the wrong. They did not admit that polygamy was not a part of the divine plan for the salvation of the world, nor that it was not proper for those who hold the keys of the priesthood to dictate the laws for the State. The most they said was that they would suspend these doctrines.

In view of such conditions, it is not strange that, at a time when the nation is preoccupied with great world problems, this people, whose one idea is that they are to overturn all worldly

government, should have found their opportunity of presenting again to Congress those principles for which they had sacrificed so much. That they have never really abandoned the idea of one day making these principles triumphant, and that their pretended surrender was only a *ruse* to gain the protection of statehood, are thoughts that are now impressing the minds of those who have followed the course of Mormonism since the supposed revolution in their faith.

In the first place, polygamy has not been abandoned as a necessary part of Mormon doctrine. It is still a principle as vital to salvation as that of repentance. The revelation which the "prophet," Joseph Smith, promulgated begins solemnly :

"Verily, thus saith the Lord unto you, My servant Joseph, that inasmuch as you have inquired of My hand to know and understand wherein I, the Lord, justified My servants Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, as also Moses, David and Solomon, My servants, touching the principle and doctrine of their having many wives and concubines: Behold! and lo, I am the Lord, thy God, and will answer thee as touching this matter. Therefore, prepare to receive and obey the instructions which I am about to give unto you; for all those who have this law revealed unto them must obey the same; *for behold, I reveal unto you a new and everlasting covenant; and if ye abide not by that covenant then ye are damned*; for no one can reject this covenant and be permitted to enter into My glory; for all who will have a blessing at My hands shall abide the law which was appointed for that blessing, and the conditions thereof *as was instituted from before the foundation of the world*; and as pertaining to the new and everlasting covenant, it was instituted for the fullness of My glory; and he that receiveth the fullness thereof, must and shall abide the law or he shall be damned, saith the Lord God."

There is no hint, in these high-sounding phrases, of the polygamy of the Orientals, none of the merely physical elements on which are founded the harems of the Turk and the dreams of houris of the Arab. There is no suggestion of immorality that instinctively offends the senses. Rather, in the eyes of those who believe Joseph Smith was the "prophet," paving the way for the coming dispensation of Jesus Christ, the revelation is the reassertion of a majestic principle instituted by the God of the universe, and far above all thoughts of mere human passions. The revelation continues :

"Abraham received promises concerning his seed and of the fruit of his loins, from whose loins ye are—namely, My servant Joseph Smith—which were to continue so long as they were in the world, and, as touching Abraham and his seed out of the world they shall continue. This promise is yours also because ye are of Abraham. Go ye, therefore, and do the works of Abraham; enter ye into My law and ye shall be saved."

Succeeding prophets of the church have added to this doctrine,

strengthening the idea that the plan of plural marriage was not a temporary expedient, but a necessary part of the plan of salvation. Brigham Young told the people that Eve was only one of the wives of Adam when they came to this world to people it, and that Adam had come from among the gods, and was the only god with whom this world would be concerned. Men were taught that their position in the world to come would depend upon their activity in peopling this. Women were informed that the last dispensation—when Jesus Christ Himself should appear—was not far away, and that millions of souls were awaiting in the other world to be given “tabernacles of flesh” before that glorious time. Those who entered the order, it was declared, should become gods and rulers and queens in the world to come, while those who held themselves aloof should be only angels and servants to the faithful. In the Mormon theology, it will thus be seen, polygamy is not a question to be decided on grounds of human inclination, but a great vital principle on which is hinging salvation for themselves and for those souls in a previous existence who cannot reach the highest glory without being born into this world.

Against this stern and “everlasting” doctrine stands only one utterance of the Mormon church—the manifesto issued in 1890 by the late “prophet,” Wilford Woodruff. By the liberal ones among the Mormons, and by the Gentiles hopeful of true Americanism in Utah, this document was taken as a formal abandonment of polygamy. Yet, when one reads it carefully, it appears woefully weak beside the command uttered by Joseph Smith. “My advice to the Latter Day Saints is to refrain from contracting any marriage forbidden by the law of the land,” are the only words in it that can be construed as an abandonment of polygamy. In court, it is true, President Woodruff explained that the manifesto was intended to lead his people to “obey all the laws of the land.” The present prophet, Lorenzo Snow, testified that the intention was that “the law should be observed in all matters concerning plural marriage.” The manifesto was further interpreted in a petition for amnesty in 1891, addressed to President Cleveland, in which it was stated that “the present head of the church, in anguish and prayer, cried to God for help for his flock, and received permission to advise the members of the church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, that the law commanding polygamy was henceforth suspended.”

Suspended! There is the key to the revival of the polygamy problem. There is not one syllable, in authoritative Mormon utterances, to show that the obligation to "do the works of Abraham" has been lessened in the theology of the church. There is nothing to show for what time the doctrine is suspended, and the inference is obvious that, whenever the Mormon priesthood shall decide to end the period of suspension, the revelation of Joseph Smith—still threatening damnation to those who refuse obedience—will have all its old force in Mormon theology. Nor is there any need of making public announcement of this decision. It may be carried in secret from the head of the church through the priesthood meetings to the faithful members, and no Gentile and no doubtful Mormon be the wiser. The revelation of polygamy for nine years was denied by Mormon leaders while they lived under the system, and was not announced until 1852, when, in the fastnesses of the Rocky Mountains, it was considered safe to give this new doctrine to the world.

Now, to turn to the other objectionable phase of Mormonism, it can be asserted with equal positiveness that the doctrine of church control in political affairs has not been modified, but at best merely altered in its application. It is this doctrine that has filled Mormon history with tales of riots and bloodshed, emigrations and suffering. From the organization of their church the Mormon people have always recognized a higher authority than the Government of the United States. That higher authority they have called God, but it has been represented by the "prophet" president of the church, his two counselors and the quorum of twelve apostles. Until the division on national party lines in Utah, in 1891, that authority had always been followed blindly and unitedly by the people. Such slavish obedience had aroused the anger of the people of Missouri and Illinois in turn, and in the first half of the century had caused the expulsion of the Mormons from the regions of civilization. In Utah it awakened the most bitter sentiment, Americans resenting the idea that any other motive than the good of the Republic should dictate the acts of voters.

Mormon theological works are filled with commands to the people to obey their leaders in the priesthood in all things. "His (the prophet's) words ye shall receive as if from My mouth," says one of Joseph Smith's revelations. "Whatever I might have ob-

tained in the shape of learning by search or study," said Wilford Woodruff in the days of his apostleship, "whatever principles I may have imbibed during my scientific researches, yet, if the prophet of God should tell me that a certain theory or principle which I might have learned was not true, I do not care what my ideas might have been, I would consider if my duty at the suggestion of my file leader to abandon that principle or theory." "If Brother Brigham (Young) tells me to do anything, it is the same as though the Lord told me to do it," said Heber C. Kimball, a leader of olden days. "Mormonism is comprised in one sentence," said Apostle George Teasdale a few years ago; "pay your tithing and obey the priesthood." It was under such doctrines as these that Joseph Smith, in Illinois, bargained with politicians for the votes of his people, and the successors of the "prophet" dictated the choice of officials in Utah from ward justices of the peace to delegate in Congress.

Immediately following the issuance of the manifesto on polygamy, or in 1891, the Mormon first presidency in an authorized interview gave what purported to be a promise that church and state in Utah should be separated. "The church will not assert any right to control the political action of its members," they said. They went even further, and made this personal statement: "As officers of the church, we disclaim the right to control the political action of the members of our body." Here again, however, is a careful avoidance of any qualification of the vital principle of the Mormon faith. The pledges bind nobody as to action in politics, but simply disclaim a right supposed to exist. Mormon officials are as free as ever to "counsel" their followers in politics, as they do in church affairs and business matters, perhaps not asserting any right to dictate, but knowing that their doctrine makes their counsel the word of God to the faithful among their followers.

That a far stronger interpretation was put upon these pledges, by the liberal Mormons, by the Gentiles of Utah and by the people of the country, cannot be doubted. Americans are not used to the subtleties of Eastern diplomacy. They accepted the Mormon utterances in the broadest sense. Nor is this surprising when we remember that even those who had been able most keenly to penetrate the depths of Mormon practices, failed to note the inconclusive nature of assurances upon which the Mormon people

asked for statehood. Those who doubted had their suspicions set at rest by the belief that the Mormons themselves were weary of polygamy and priestly rule, and were prepared to resist any attempt to restore the conditions under which they suffered so grievously. Delegate J. L. Rawlins, now Senator, voiced the conservative sentiment in Utah when he said, in the House of Representatives, in 1893: "The people of Utah shrink from no test not violative of the fundamental principles upon which our institutions rest;" and "the practice of polygamy is not only discontinued, but, so far as the great mass of the Mormon people is concerned, is eradicated as a belief."

It is only now—when Utah has sent as its Representative in Congress one who typifies militant Mormonism—that the real nature of Mormon surrender has been learned; and the Gentiles of Utah are coming to realize that they are at last under the complete control of a sect which seems determined to compel the nation to recognize that which it has been at so much pains to repress. This is a strong statement, involving as it does the weal of a people three hundred thousand strong. I would hesitate long to make it, had not personal investigation, conversations with those who have watched the growth of Mormonism for a score of years, contact with Mormons who guide the policy of the church, and a close study of the course of affairs in Utah since 1890, brought the conviction that the un-American policy of Brigham Young is the policy of Lorenzo Snow and his followers.

Sufficient evidence in support of this statement is found in the attitude of Brigham H. Roberts, whom the people of Utah elected to Congress last November by a majority of 6,000. Around him have centered many of the dramatic events in the recent political history of Utah, and he represents, perhaps better than anybody else, the aspirations of the Mormon leaders and the obedience of their followers. He is a high official, one of the "first seven presidents of seventies," the leaders of the great body of elders. He is the author of the leading modern works on Mormon theology, including an essay to prove that all the Christian churches apostatized after the time of Christ; a pamphlet to demonstrate that Brigham Young was the legitimate successor of Joseph Smith; a discussion of the first principles of the Mormon gospel, and finally a volume upholding the divinity of the mission of Joseph Smith. He has devoted many years to missionary work



for the church, and, in 1893, he was formally recognized as the leading speaker in it by being chosen to present its doctrines to the Congress of Religions at the World's Fair in Chicago.

In his latest volume, "The New Witness for God," is found the advanced belief of Mormonism. The work was examined by a committee of theologians, appointed especially by the first presidency of the church, who pronounced it "orthodox and consistent with our teachings." It was published in 1895, years after the supposed revolution within the church, and yet there is in it no sign of abatement of the doctrines taught by Joseph Smith and Brigham Young. No stronger assertion of the ideas underlying polygamy could be found than in this passage:

"When I say that the prophet taught that the resurrection is a reality, that the relationship of husband and wife is intended to be eternal, together with all its endearing affections, I mean all that in its most literal sense. . . . Instead of the God-given power of pro-creation being one of the chief things that is to pass away, it is *one of the chief means of man's exaltation and glory in that great eternity* which, like an endless vista, stretches out before him. Through it, man attains to the glory of the endless increase of eternal lives, and the right of presiding as priest and patriarch, king and lord over his ever-increasing posterity. . . . Through that law, in connection with all the other laws of the Gospel, *man will yet attain unto the power of the Godhead.*"

Nor is the assertion of the authority of the priesthood any less emphatic. Speaking of the organization of the Mormon church, he says:

"First and highest of all officers, stands the first presidency, consisting of three presiding high priests. *Their jurisdiction and authority are universal.* Their jurisdiction extends over all the affairs of the church, as well in temporal as in spiritual things. . . . The quorum of the twelve apostles are equal in power and authority to the first presidency. . . . The first quorum of seventies" (of which Mr. Roberts is a president) "are equal in authority to the quorum of the twelve. . . . None, not even the highest, is beyond the operation of the laws and councils of the church."

Now, having demonstrated, I believe, that Mormonism is still unchanged theoretically, it remains only to inquire whether its practices are still in accord with its theories. Has it really abandoned polygamy as an active tenet, and has the authority of the priesthood been absent from the councils of state in Utah since 1891?

Answering the first half of the question, we have abundant evidence that polygamy in one form, at least, is still being actively practiced in the State. Mr. Roberts was opposed, throughout his canvass for Congress, on the ground that one of plural

wives had borne children to him within two years. This not only was not denied, but it brought forth the statement that the leading men of the church were in the same position, President Snow himself being publicly charged with having a child by his last plural wife within the last two years. The Presbyterian missionaries of Utah declared that more than 2,000 children had been born in polygamy since Utah became a State on the first of January, 1896; and the reply of the Mormon church to this assertion was an editorial in the "*Deseret News*," the official church organ, declaring that there was an "understanding, not to say, contract," with the nation that old relations should not be disturbed, and that the system should be permitted to die out with this generation. There is no disposition anywhere to deny that polygamous relations entered into before 1890 are still continued.

This in itself is highly significant, as indicating a Mormon purpose to uphold plural marriage at all hazards. That there was no "understanding" that these relations should be continued is easily demonstrated. The amnesty proclamations of both Presidents Harrison and Cleveland extended executive clemency to those polygamists only, who should not thereafter transgress the law against "cohabitation" with plural wives. Moreover, the Mormon legislature of 1892 passed a territorial law to punish all who might commit this offence; that law was drafted into the statute books of the State by a code commission headed by a Mormon, and it still exists there, though now made a dead letter.

There would be little disposition, however, to renew the attack on the Mormons, if this were their only offence. It might be considered too ungenerous, no doubt, to demand that women who had been sealed to men in plurality for "time and eternity" should be put aside by their husbands. The really important question in this connection is, whether the disregard of this one obligation by the people is paving the way for the announcement that new polygamous marriages are being made, and that the doctrine is being taught within the church with its old vigor.

In a recent visit to Utah I had occasion to investigate, in Salt Lake City, twenty cases wherein it was charged that new polygamous marriages had been made. These were not isolated instances, either, for I received evidence that such cases could be multiplied many fold in other parts of the State. The evidence, I found, was of such a nature that I could not doubt there had

been new marriages, that the church had sanctioned them, and that every precaution was being taken to keep them secret, until the time should come when the church should see fit to announce openly its determination to restore plural marriage. Former Senator Frank J. Cannon, in a recent address in Salt Lake City, has openly charged two leading apostles with such a design. Members of the twelve apostles and the first quorum of seventies, who, to quote Mr. Roberts, "are the witnesses of the Lord Jesus Christ in all the nations of the earth," figured in these instances.

In cases of this nature the ceremony is believed to have been performed outside of Utah, in order to retain the appearance of respecting the constitutional prohibition of polygamous marriages, exacted by Congress as a condition of statehood. There are large colonies of Mormons in Canada and Mexico, and in them it is charged such marriages are being performed. Proof of the ceremonies is, however, inaccessible. The whole power of our Government could never bring forth a record of polygamous marriages, and only twenty-nine convictions for the offense of taking new wives were made in the seven years of the polygamy prosecutions, as against hundreds for "unlawful cohabitation."

Such a state of affairs, in fact, would be in thorough accord with the present teachings in the church. "The belief in plural marriage is as much a part of our belief as it ever was," are the words uttered last year by Owen A. Woodruff, the youngest member of the Apostles. "I feel to sustain the principles of the gospel, even to the extent of taking more wives, if necessary," are the words of Apostle Heber J. Grant, spoken only last November. Mr. Roberts taunted the Christians in the "Improvement Era," a church publication, last May, with the necessity of believing in polygamy if they believed in Abraham. Such teachings within the last three years, in priesthood meetings, gatherings of young men and women, in the Mormon press, and even in the conferences of the people, are portents of the new revival within the church.

Turning now to the latter part of our question, the proof is more definite as to the relations between church and State. Revelations of secret manipulations made within the last three years demonstrate that at no time have the church leaders lost their control of politics. My statements on this point are based on evidence of which there has been no attempt at contradiction.

The division of the Mormon people in 1891 into Democrats and Republicans was not a spontaneous popular movement. It was decided upon at a meeting of the church leaders and the territorial committee of the People's or Mormon party. The Saints, left to their own resources, turned overwhelmingly to the Democratic party in the first year of their freedom. The Mormon leaders soon found this unfortunate, however, for their representatives were received coldly by President Harrison and a Republican Senate when attempts were made to secure statehood and amnesty for polygamy. Orders were then given that the people should be more evenly divided, in order to enable the leaders to hold a balance of power, as well as to make both parties anxious to gain the support of the prospective State. Apostles went through the territory, and in priesthood meetings actually designated men to be Republicans, and gave orders for the equal division. The result was a great decrease in the Democratic vote in 1892, and the election of a Republican delegate in 1894. An admission was made in the recent session of the Utah Legislature, on behalf of George Q. Cannon, of the Mormon first presidency, that in this time "he did plead with some of the brethren that they did not have to be Democrats."

This programme was opposed by an influential element in the church, the leaders of which were Moses Thatcher, B. H. Roberts and A. W. Ivins. These men gained a great following by 1895, the year of the first election of State officers. In the northern and southern counties of Utah, they had organized formidable opposition among the young Mormons, and had set at defiance the orders of the priesthood. Mr. Ivins was the choice of the younger Democratic element for Governor, but a week before the party's State convention he was ordered to take charge of the Mexican mission of the church, and could do nothing but obey. Mr. Thatcher was nominated for a Senatorship and Mr. Roberts for Congressman. In the midst of their canvass, President Woodruff criticised them for not taking counsel of their church leaders before accepting the nominations, and it was then that a Democratic State convention was reconvened, open charges of the use of church influence were made by Mormons, and strong resolutions demanding the divorcement of church and state were adopted. Mr. Thatcher and Mr. Roberts both defied their ecclesiastical superiors, and were supported by a great body of the churchmen.

They were defeated, however, and at the next conference a manifesto was issued by the high church authorities, which said:

"We unanimously agree to and promulgate as a rule that should always be observed in the church and by every leading official thereof, that, before accepting any position, political or otherwise, which would interfere with the proper and complete discharge of his ecclesiastical duties, and before accepting a nomination or entering into engagements to perform new duties, said official should apply to the proper authorities and learn whether he can, consistently with the obligations already entered into with the church upon assuming office, take upon himself the added duties and labors and responsibilities of the new position."

Mr. Thatcher refused to sign this document. He was stripped of his apostleship, hurt in his business affairs, partially ostracised socially, and defeated in his effort to be elected to the United States Senate. Mr. Roberts signed the manifesto. He retired from the editorial chair of the "Salt Lake Herald" because of his action, and for two years took no part in politics. In the meantime, the leaders of the independent element of young Mormons were crushed politically, or sent away on missions for the church, and the rebellion died out. The result was the nomination last year of Mr. Roberts by a Democratic convention, which obeyed the will of Apostle Grant, the church leader who had been most active in suppressing all opposition to the political manifesto. Of those young Mormons who led the fight against church and State, Mr. Roberts is the only one who has succeeded in Utah politics, and the favor undoubtedly has come to him because he gave his influence to the church at the critical moment when it had set out to crush Mr. Thatcher.

Practically every important executive office in Utah is now in the hands of those who can be trusted to make no objection to the plans of the church leaders. The Legislature is kept in constant touch with the church office, when in session, by a committee of high churchmen, who watch all legislation and counsel policy in all matters in which Mormon interests may be concerned.

Only one political organization of importance is held by the Gentiles—the School Board of Salt Lake City. An election for members of that body, last December, is the best illustration of the union of church and State, even in the centre of enlightenment of Utah. The Mormons needed one member of the Board to divide it evenly and two for a majority. They wished to control the Salt Lake City system, in order to abolish a high school which seriously competes with their church seminaries, to stop the liberal

teachings that have been turning young Mormons away from the doctrines of their fathers, and also because of patronage and a salary list of \$155,000 yearly. Once in control, the Mormon leaders could put devout churchmen in place of the teachers now employed—many of whom are of their faith however—and could exact from appointees the payment of the tithing which the church demands.

In one of the municipal wards of Salt Lake City, in December, a Mormon was openly a candidate against a Gentile who had been nominated by a non-partisan convention. In another, a candidate who had been nominated by a mass meeting was apparently unopposed, but learned only on the day before election that the Mormon leaders were plotting to defeat him, and that orders had been given by priests that all good Saints should vote for another man. These priests worked for the Mormon candidate at the polls next day, and it was only by a few score of votes out of 2,200 that the people's candidate was elected. Some liberal Mormons refused to follow priestly counsel, and saved the schools to the Gentiles; but the proof is clear that the great body of the churchmen in the capital itself are ready to do what they are told is in the "interests of Zion."

These are the conditions which have driven all the ministers of the Protestant churches of Utah together, and have brought a firm belief to many of the Gentiles that the old Mormon and anti-Mormon parties will soon be restored. What the end of such a fight would be no person can tell. The Mormons comprise about three-fourths of the population of Utah, and, with its immense power, the church could always rely on having a substantial following among the Gentiles. It would be forced to meet discontent and dissatisfaction within its own ranks, but a serious schism could not occur. Any attempt to start a movement against the designs of the leaders would be crushed, just as the Thatcher rebellion was. At any moment, the whole business, political and religious pressure of the priesthood can be brought against any man who might dare stand as a leader against it. In the history of Mormonism nobody has been found strong enough to resist this pressure. Mr. Thatcher, the strongest of all the revolutionists, bowed before the threat that he would be cast out from the body, believing, as he did, that by excommunication he would lose his hope of salvation.

The priesthood can always rely on the women. They have been the strength of the church, even under that system of polygamy which made them "living martyrs." They have the full right of suffrage, and none who is not in accord with the church authorities need look for their support. The men are subject to a constant discipline that keeps them at all times in sympathy with the ambitions of the leaders. There are 1,500 Mormon missionaries now in the foreign work of the church, the brightest of its young men, the future leaders in all matters. They are compelled to sacrifice everything and to labor for two or three years far from home in the interests of their religion. None who goes through this experience ever forgets the power of the priesthood, and each understands that if he should show too great a spirit of independence, he may be called again to make the sacrifice. No young man in the church may be married in one of the temples unless he is faithful and obedient to his superiors, and no young woman would consider herself married in the sight of God unless she was "sealed" by the proper authorities. In business, in politics, in social life, everywhere, the young man meets the church, and he must be of iron if he dares to stand out against it. Many have done so in the past, but they have been the exceptions. Their numbers have never been sufficient to offset the church itself.

Thus, at present, the control of affairs in Utah lies wholly with the priesthood. It has spread its influence from Lethbridge, in Canada, to the centre of Chihuahua, in Mexico. Mormons have eleven members of the Legislature in Idaho, their settlements are spreading through Colorado, Wyoming, Montana, Washington and Nevada. Their ambition is to control the nations of the world, and they have been promised that the time is not far distant when they will spread over North and South America, and become rulers of men, indeed. They have 300,000 members now. They gained 63,000 in membership last year, exceeding all other churches in their success in missionary work. Aggressive, devoted, determined, they present again a problem that well merits the attention of our wisest statesmen.

EUGENE YOUNG.